



Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board
Tuesday, October 1, 2019
Parish Hall, St. Andrew's Church
545 S. 5th Avenue
E. 16th Street and S. 5th Avenue
Tucson, Arizona

Legal Action Report/Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 6:33pm. A quorum was initially established with nine board members present: Ms. S. Bachman-Williams, Mr. J. Burr, Ms. P. Factor, Mr. G. Furnier, Mr. S. Grede, Ms. M. McClements, Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. M. Roberts and Ms. G. Schau. (Mr. M. Crum joined the meeting at 6:44 pm, following item 2.) Absent: Mr. T. Beal.

2. Approval of Minutes

Action Taken: A motion was made by Ms. Factor to approve the meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Roberts. Nine votes in favor: Ms. S. Bachman-Williams, Mr. J. Burr, Ms. P. Factor, Mr. G. Furnier, Mr. S. Grede, Ms. M. McClements, Mr. P. O'Brien, Mr. M. Roberts and Ms. G. Schau.

3. Call to the Audience

None.

4. Reviews

a. HPZ 19-84, 375 S. Stone Avenue

Reconfiguration of the lot lines and rezoning to remove a portion of the lot zoned "H."

Full Review

Ms. Robin Large provided an overview of the rezoning of the parcels, and how the rezoning will take place concurrently with the IID review process for the proposed new building on the vacant parcel. Initially, it was not the developer's intention to rezone the parcels but the process has revealed that in fact a rezoning is required.

The Brady Court parcel currently has a "leg" that extends all the way to Stone Avenue, and cuts the C- zoned parking lot in two. A portion of the new building would need to be on that "leg" to be viable. Because it does not contain any historic resources, that area of the parcel doesn't protect anything. The current proposal reconfigures the remaining "H" parcel for Brady Court at 10' west and south of the building footprint to meet building code requirements. The remaining portions of all the lots will become a single new parcel with C-3 zoning. In

exchange for the reduction of the “H” parcel, the developer has agreed to place an historic preservation condition on the historic adobe building on the southeast corner of the lots, and ensure compatibility with the historic buildings.

Mr. Bill Mackey continued the presentation, by noting that the adobe building has been reviewed as a courtesy by the APHZAB to return it to its 1920’s (rehabilitated) look when the 1890’s stable was converted to parking uses. He expects it may come back for review if revised. He presented the Sanborn maps that show how the buildings were related in the past, and provided additional detail on the restoration of Brady Court.

He then presented the new mixed use IID project for a new 4 story building that has 28 new one and two bedroom condos, with an office and restaurant (hopefully Casa Vincente) on the first floor. A re-siting of the building means that streetscape plantings will be included, with two courtyard areas, and a parking lot that provides 51 spaces. The parking plan has already been addressed through an IPP. A brief overview of the design elements showed how the building relates to the historic buildings in the area.

The Board asked for clarification on its purview. Ms. Brown clarified that the review was specifically for the rezoning and its conditions, not specifically the new building design which would be reviewed by PRS and the IID-DRC, because after the rezoning, the building would not be in the HPZ. However, this is the opportunity to comment on the proposed building if there are concerns.

The Board was concerned about the appendage of the “H” parcel and what it may have been intended for. Ms. Brown clarified that it was merely a remnant parcel and had no historic relationship to Brady Court.

The Board suggested that an exchange of the historic adobe stable/ garage that is currently listed on the National Register, but not in the HPZ could be appropriate for the reconfiguration. Ms. Brown stated that she did not believe that was appropriate because it was an accessory structure that was unrelated to any of the remaining historic structures (it was built prior to Brady Court), and was not consistent with preservation standards. She noted that the zoning condition requiring historic review was the best compromise.

The Board noted that the proposed building did appear to be relatively compatible to the historic district. It thanked the architect for now using metal clad wood windows/ doors instead of the original vinyl clad windows which are inconsistent with UDC historic guidelines. The other exterior design elements appear to be related to and consistent with historic structures in the historic zone.

It was noted that the reconfigured parcel would simplify the design review process so that the advisory board would not need to be consulted for the parking lot and miscellaneous elements. Also, it was noted that the new building would be limited to 48’ total height if the parcels were not rezoned. The new proposed building, while taller than historic buildings in the district, is not inconsistent with other modern buildings in the vicinity.

Action Taken: The Board recommends the approval of the rezoning to the new parcel configuration for Brady Court, removing the “leg” and creating two new parcels (H zoning of Brady Court at 10’ West and South of the building footprint; existing North and East) provided that a rezoning condition be made for the preservation of the historic, APHNRD listed adobe structure (stable/ auto parking) located on the southeast corner of the new C-3 parcel; to be administered by the City’s HPO with HPO and APHZAB review in perpetuity and (that in the event that the IID overlay zoning sunsets) will require the full Mayor and Council demolition procedure (for future development); and finally that all exterior details on the new IID project will be historically “compatible”, per the UDC Armory Park historic Design Guidelines.

Motion made by Mr. Burr, seconded by Ms. Factor. Ten votes in favor: Ms. Bachman-Williams, Mr. Beal, Mr. Burr, Mr. Crum, Ms. Factor, Mr. Furnier, Mr. Grede, Ms. McClements, Mr. O’Brien and Ms. Schau. One vote against: Mr. Roberts.

a. HPZ 19-78, 524 S. Herbert Avenue

Rehabilitation of an existing building; new stucco, roof repairs and shingle replacement, fencing and gates; repair and restore windows and doors; new rear addition.

Courtesy Review/Contributing Resource

Mr. Gonzales provided a revised site plan for a new configuration of the proposed addition that was significantly smaller than the plan presented at the September 17 meeting. The addition has been reduced so that the rehabilitated building will now only have 52% lot coverage and both sides of the addition have been inset 4’ from the lot lines. The floor plan shows the original adobe 4 room structure, with reduced demolitions of the interior walls. He now suggests that all windows will be wood and that the replacements will be the original 2 over 2 configuration. He proposed reducing the new roofline to 13’ and setting it further back from the ridge-line, which will allow for the retention of the historic chimney.

The Board thanked Mr. Gonzales for his thoughtful revisions noting that the new setbacks will reinforce the hierarchy of the original historic structure and its relationship to the new addition, and will rectify the the issues of egress (door and window) and utility access. It was also suggested that the angled wall containing the door would be more compatible if it was consistent with the rectilinear elements of the building.

The Board suggested that a reconfigured roofline would perhaps be a better option. One possibility would be to add a gabled connection onto the original gabled roof to connect to a new parapeted addition. This would better retain the original design language of the historic structure. Mr. Gonzales noted that this might be an easier construction to build.

The Board noted that the original exterior adobe walls will now be retained, and that some original interior adobe walls will also be retained. However, it noted that the west wall appeared to show two new openings on either side of a filled in original opening and asked for clarification on replacement materials for the structural reconfigurations.

The Board also commented on the window and door schemes. It noted that the new windows were still shown as horizontal sliding windows and would be more appropriate as vertical openings similar to the existing windows. It was noted that transoms above the doors should be retained. It was also noted that stucco repair would be preferable on the historic structure to not compromise the adobe walls. Original trim pieces could then be retained.

The Board requested that elevations/ exterior elements be included in the next review, and that site context (adjacent historic buildings) be shown.

No action taken.

5. Design Guidelines Project

a. Update on the design guidelines

Martha provided an update on the first PRS review of the V 5.3 Design Guidelines at the meeting on 9-26-19. Martha, John and Ken were present. The review is moving on a line by line basis and only made it to page 10 during the meeting. It is scheduled to return to PRS on 10-24-19. Mr. Burr noted that while concerns were raised about several concepts and statements, that the PRS had been open to explanations of why they had been included. It is expected that another draft may be required after the review process.

6. Minor Review Update

a. Updates on recent Minor Reviews provided

Martha provided an update on the one minor review anticipated; a roof replacement at 245 S. 5th Ave.

7. Call to the Board

Mr. Burr noted that the Welcome Broadway PAD would be presented at the 10-7 Zoning Examiner public hearing. He also mentioned that there is an IID-DRC meeting on 10-15 that will look at the planned 13 story building that will replace Maloney's tavern on N. 4th Ave., as well as the new 5 story building proposed for 140 E. Broadway, next to the Julian Drew building.

8. Call to the Audience

Ms. Brown thanked the board for attending the mandatory annual training sessions in September. Staff is reviewing how they will be done for next year's required training.

Mr. Taylor thanked Mr. Burr for attending the 9-24 PRS meeting and defending the content of the design guidelines.

9. Future Agenda Items-Information Only

None discussed.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:36pm.